

1
2
3 THE DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM
4

5
6 GOVERNMENT OF GUAM and
7 DOUGLAS B. MOYLAN, in his official
8 capacity as Attorney General of Guam,

9 Plaintiffs,

10 vs.

11 LOURDES A. LEON GUERRERO, in her
12 official capacity as the Governor of Guam, and
13 the GUAM HOUSING AND URBAN
14 RENEWAL AUTHORITY, a Public Body
15 Corporate and Politic,

16 Defendants.

CIVIL CASE NO. 24-00029

ORDER

Granting in Part Motion for Extension of
Time to File Reply to Defendants'
Opposition to Motion to Amend
(ECF No. 27)

17 On July 22, 2025, the Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint, and
18 the Defendants filed a Joint Opposition to the motion on August 12, 2025. *See* ECF Nos. 20 and 25.

19 On August 19, 2025, the Plaintiffs filed the instant Motion for Extension of Time to File a
20 Responsive Pleading to Defendants' Response in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Amend (the
21 "Motion for Extension of Time"), asking that they be given an additional two weeks to file a reply
22 brief to the Defendants' Joint Opposition.¹ *See* Mot. Extension of Time at ¶ 6, ECF No. 27. Among
23 various reasons raised, the Plaintiffs asserted that a two-week extension was warranted because of
24 counsel's workload and based on the length of Joint Opposition.²

25 ¹ Pursuant to CVLR 7(f), the Plaintiffs' reply would be due on August 26, 2025, but the
26 Plaintiffs asked that they be given up to and including September 9, 2025, to file a reply.

27 ² The court notes that the Joint Opposition did not exceed the page limit set forth in
CVLR 7(c). Counsel's declaration in support of the Joint Opposition consists of 143 pages,
including exhibits.

1 On August 20, 2025, the Governor of Guam filed an Opposition to the Motion for Extension
2 of Time, arguing that the Plaintiffs have failed to show good cause to justify the requested extension.
3 *See* ECF No. 28.

4 The court does not find that good cause exists to warrant a two-week extension to file a reply
5 brief, but because the arguments raised in the Joint Opposition are somewhat complex, the court will
6 grant a shorter extension. The Motion for Extension of Time is granted in part, and the Plaintiffs
7 shall have until and including August 29, 2025, to reply to the Joint Opposition.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.



/s/ Michael J. Bordallo
U.S. Magistrate Judge
Dated: Aug 21, 2025